Study section	September 1975 meetings	Time	Location
Toxicology, Dr. Rob S. McCutcheon, room 226, telephone 301-496-7570.	18-20	8:00	Do.
Tropical Medicine and Parasitology, Dr. George W. Luttermoser, room 319, telephone 301-496-7494.	6-8	8:30	Landow Bldg., Bethesda, Md.
Virology, Dr. Claire H. Winestock, room 340, telephone 301-496-7128.	25-27	8:30	Bldg. 31, Bethesda, Md.
Visual Sciences A, Dr. Orvil E. A. Bolduan, room 2A-05, telephone 301-496-7150.	10-12	9:00	Embassy Row Hotel, Washington, D.C.
Visual Sciences B, Dr. Marie A. Jakus, room 353, telephone 301-496-7251.	10-13	9:00	Holiday Inn, Bethesda, Md.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 13.333, 13.349, 13.393-13.396, 13.836-13.844, 13.846-13.871, 13.876, National Institutes of Health, DHEW)

Dated: July 14, 1975.

SUZANNE L. FREMEAU,
Committee Management Officer,
National Institutes of Health.

[FR Doc.75-18670 Filed 7-17-75;8:45 am]

NATIONAL HEART AND LUNG INSTITUTE

Meeting

Notice is hereby given of the Workshop Group on Extracorporeal Treatment of Blood meeting, sponsored by the National Heart and Lung Institute, September 4-5, 1975, Building 31, Conference Room 4-A, National Institutes of Health Campus, Bethesda, Maryland.

This meeting will be open to the public on September 4 and 5 from 9 a.m. to adjournment. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss mechanisms for extracorporeal treatment of blood in sickle cell disease. Attendance by the public will be limited to space available.

Dr. John I. Hercules, Health Scientist Administrator, Sickle Cell Disease Branch, National Heart and Lung Institute, National Institutes of Health, Building 31, Room 5A03, Bethesda, Maryland 20014, (301) 496-6932, will provide additional information.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program No. 13.839, National Institutes of Health)

Dated: July 14, 1975.

SUZANNE L. FREMEAU,
Committee Management Officer,
National Institutes of Health.

[FR Doc.75-18669 Filed 7-17-75;8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Federal Disaster Assistance Administration

[FDAA-475-DR; N-75-389]

NORTH DAKOTA

Major Disaster and Related Determinations

Pursuant to the authority vested in the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development by the President under Executive Order 11795 of July 11, 1974, and delegated to me by the Secretary under Department of Housing and Urban Development Delegation of Authority, Docket No. D-74-285; and by virtue of the Act of May 22, 1974, entitled "Disaster Relief Act of 1974" (88 Stat. 143); notice is hereby given that on July 11, 1975, the President declared a major disaster as follows:

I have determined that the damage in certain areas of the State of North Dakota resulting from severe storms and flooding beginning about June 27, 1975, is of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant a major disaster declaration under Pub. L. 93-288. I therefore declare that such a major disaster exists in the State of North Dakota.

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to the authority vested in the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under Executive Order 11795, and delegated to me by the Secretary under Department of Housing and Urban Development Delegation of Authority, Docket No. D-74-285, I hereby appoint Mr. Donald G. Eddy, HUD Region VIII, to act as the Federal Coordinating Officer for this declared major disaster.

I do hereby determine the following areas of the State of North Dakota to have been adversely affected by this declared major disaster:

The Counties of:

Barnes	Ransom
Cass	Richland
Dickey	Sargent
La Moure	Stutsman

Dated: July 11, 1975.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 14.701, Disaster Assistance)

WILLIAM E. CROCKETT,
Acting Administrator, Federal Disaster Assistance Administration.

[FR Doc.75-18711 Filed 7-17-75;8:45 am]

Office of Interstate Land Sales Registration

[Docket No. N-75-391]

OLYMPIC HEIGHTS

Hearing

In the matter of Olympic Heights, OILSR No. 0-2248-04-452 Docket No. Y-1168-IS.

Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1706(d) and 24 CFR 1720.160(d) Notice is hereby given that:

1. Calprop Corporation, Victor Zoccaglin, President, its officers and agents, hereinafter referred to as "Respondent," being subject to the provisions of the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act (Pub. L. 90-448) (15 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), received a Notice of Proceedings and Opportunity for Hearing issued May 15, 1975, which was sent to the developer pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1706(d), 24 CFR 1710.45(b)(1) and 1720.125 informing the developer of information obtained by the Office of Interstate Land Sales Registration alleging that the Statement of Record and Property Report for Olympic Heights, located in Nevada County, California, contain untrue statements of material fact or omit to state material facts required to be stated therein or necessary to make the statements therein not misleading.

2. The Respondent filed an Answer received June 16, 1975, in response to the Notice of Proceedings and Opportunity for Hearing.

3. In said Answer the Respondent requested a hearing on the allegations contained in the Notice of Proceedings and Opportunity for Hearing.

4. Therefore, pursuant to the provisions of 15 U.S.C. 1706(d) and 24 CFR 1720.160(d), *It is hereby ordered*, That a public hearing for the purpose of taking evidence on the questions set forth in the Notice of Proceedings and Opportunity for Hearing will be held before Judge James W. Mast, in Room 7146, Department of HUD, 451 7th Street, SW., Washington, D.C., on September 9, 1975, at 10 a.m.

The following time and procedure is applicable to such hearing: All affidavits and a list of all witnesses are requested to be filed with the Hearing Clerk, HUD Building, Room 10150, Washington, D.C., 20410 on or before September 2, 1975.

6. The Respondent is hereby notified that failure to appear at the above scheduled hearing shall be deemed a default and the proceedings shall be determined against Respondent, the allegations of which shall be deemed to be true, and an ORDER Suspending the Statement of Record, herein identified, shall be issued pursuant to 24 CFR 1710.45(b)(1).

This Notice shall be served upon the Respondent forthwith pursuant to 24 CFR 1720.440.

Dated: July 10, 1975.

By the Secretary.

JAMES W. MAST,
Administrative Law Judge.

[FR Doc.75-18712 Filed 7-17-75;8:45 am]

[Docket No. N-75-390]

PORT MARDI GRAS

Hearing

In the matter of Port Mardi Gras, OILSR No. 0-3597-29-178 Docket No. 75-82-IS.

Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1706(d) and 24 CFR 1720.160(d), notice is hereby given that:

1. Port Mardi Gras, Inc., Donald Schrum, President, its officers and agents, hereinafter referred to as "Respondent," being subject to the provisions of the Interstate Land Sales Full

Disclosure Act (Pub. L. 90-448) (15 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), received a Notice of Proceedings and Opportunity for Hearing issued June 16, 1975, which was sent to the developer pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1706(d), 24 CFR 1710.45(b)(1) and 1720.125 informing the developer of information obtained by the Office of Interstate Land Sales Registration alleging that the Statement of Record and Property Report for Port Mardi Gras, located in Gasconade County, Missouri, contain untrue statements of material fact or omit to state material facts required to be stated therein or necessary to make the statements therein not misleading.

2. The Respondent filed an Answer received July 3, 1975, in response to the Notice of Proceedings and Opportunity for Hearing.

3. In said Answer the Respondent requested a hearing on the allegations contained in the Notice of Proceedings and Opportunity for Hearing.

4. Therefore, pursuant to the provisions of 15 U.S.C. 1706(d) and 24 CFR 1720.160(d): *It is hereby ordered*, That a public hearing for the purpose of taking evidence on the questions set forth in the Notice of Proceedings and Opportunity for Hearing will be held before Judge James W. Mast, in Room 7146, Department of HUD, 451 7th Street SW., Washington, D.C., on July 31, 1975, at 2 p.m.

The following time and procedure is applicable to such hearing: All affidavits and a list of all witnesses are requested to be filed with the Hearing Clerk, HUD Building, Room 10150, Washington, D.C., 20410 on or before July 24, 1975.

6. The Respondent is hereby notified that failure to appear at the above scheduled hearing shall be deemed a default and the proceedings shall be determined against Respondent, the allegations of which shall be deemed to be true, and an order Suspending the Statement of Record, herein identified, shall be issued pursuant to 24 CFR 1710.45(b)(1).

This Notice shall be served upon the Respondent forthwith pursuant to 24 CFR 1720.440.

Dated: July 10, 1975.

By the Secretary.

JAMES W. MAST,
Administrative Law Judge.

[FR Doc.75-18713 Filed 7-17-75;8:45 am]

Office of the Secretary

[Docket No. D-75-354]

ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH AND THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Delegation of Authority

Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 establishes the Community Development Block Grant Program. Section 107(a) of the Act provides that funds shall be reserved and set aside in a special discretionary fund for use by the Secretary in making grants for the purposes set forth in the subsection. The power and authority of the Secretary with respect to discretionary grants under section 107(a)(4) for innovative community development projects is being delegated to the Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research and the Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development.

Section A. *Authority Delegated.* The Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research is authorized to exercise the power and authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to discretionary grants for the purpose of demonstrating innovative community development projects under section 107(a)(4) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, with the concurrence of the Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development in final approval action.

Sec. B. *Authority Excepted.* There is excepted from the authority delegated under Section A:

1. The power to issue obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury under Section 108(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. (42 U.S.C. 5308)

2. The power to sue and be sued.

3. The power and authority of the Secretary with respect to nondiscrimination under section 109 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5309), with respect to the powers to make audits and reviews under section 104(d) (42 U.S.C. 5304), and with respect to remedies for noncompliance under section 111 (42 U.S.C. 5311), except that initial proposed and final regulations with respect to such sections shall be issued by the Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development, subject, however, to revision at such time as the power and authority under these sections may be delegated by the Secretary.

Sec. C. *Authority to Redelegate.* The Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research and the Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development, are authorized to redelegate to the employees of the Department any of the authority delegated under section A, and not excepted under section B.

(Sec. 7(d), Department of HUD Act, 42 U.S.C. 3535(d))

Effective Date. This delegation of authority is effective as of August 22, 1974.

CARLA A. HILLS,
Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

[FR Doc.75-18855 Filed 7-17-75;8:45 am]

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

[Order 75-7-64; Docket 25659]

INVESTIGATION OF THE LOCAL SERVICE CLASS SUBSIDY RATE

Class Rate VII

Adopted by the Civil Aeronautics Board at its office in Washington, D.C. on the 14th day of July, 1975.

On January 24, 1974, the Board adopted Order 74-1-123, which established Class Rate VII as the fair and reasonable final subsidy rate for the local service industry on and after July 1, 1973.[1] Section IV. C. of the Rate Formula, set forth in Order 74-1-123, provides for review and updating of the provisions for offset of excess earnings from ineligible services on a recurrent six-month basis for annual periods ending in September and March of each year. Effective January 1, 1975, the Board amended Class Rate VII to provide for downward or upward adjustment of the subsidy level for eligible services.[2] Such adjustment is to be based upon a review, as provided in Section VIII B. of the Rate Formula set forth in Order 74-12-120, which is similar to and concurrent with the review of ineligible operations.[3]

The carriers have now submitted the data required for the review of both eligible and ineligible services covering the year ended March 31, 1975, in the form and detail specified in Section IV C. 7 and Section VIII B. 10. Such data have been reviewed in detail and adjustments have been made in accordance with established subsidy ratemaking principles.

Adjusted operating results, adjusted investment, plus calculations of ineligible profits and eligible need changes to be shared are contained in the attached appendices.

All carriers except Piedmont and Southern achieved excess profits on ineligible services.[4] However, the levels of excess profits were lower than in the previous review. Only Frontier has shown an improvement in eligible need relative to its adjusted base ceiling while other carriers experienced increases in eligible need. The net results are that the subsidy rates for four of the seven carriers will be set at maximum levels, effective July 1, 1975.

Based on adjusted operating results and investment for the year ended March

---

[1] In Order 73-10-1, October 1, 1973, the Board determined an adjusted subsidy level for each carrier, and proposed a formula for equitable distribution of the subsidy payments among the local service carriers. Except as modified therein, Order 74-1-123 reaffirmed and made final all of the findings and conclusions set forth in Order 73-10-1.

[2] Orders 74-12-120, December 30, 1974, and 75-3-22, March 7, 1975.

[3] The initial review, based on the year ended September 30, 1973, Order 74-2-59, February 14, 1974, established the fair and reasonable subsidy rates for each carrier from January 1, 1974 through June 30, 1974. The second review period, covering the 12 months ended March 31, 1974, Order 74-7-76, July 18, 1974, established the fair and reasonable subsidy rate for each carrier from July 1, 1974 through December 31, 1974. The third review period covering the 12 months ended September 30, 1974, Orders 74-12-119, December 30, 1974, 74-12-120, December 30, 1974, and 75-3-22, March 7, 1975, established the fair and reasonable subsidy rates for each carrier from January 1, 1975 through June 30, 1975.

[4] Although Texas International was in a full strike status from December 5, 1974 through March 31, 1975 of the review period, its operations were normalized to remove many of the abnormalities.

31, 1975, we find that the fair and reasonable annual subsidy due and payable to the seven carriers in Class Rate VII, on and after July 1, 1975, is $65.0 million. This is $8.3 million greater than the rate established in the third review by Orders 74–12–119, 74–12–120, and 75–3–22 and reflects the effects of the current economic recession on airline operations.

In addition, it is necessary to provide that the subsidy due and payable to each carrier on and after July 1, 1975, shall be computed on the basis of the daily subsidy rate set forth for each carrier in amended Appendix L (Third Revised) attached to this order:

Accordingly, it is ordered that:[5]

1. Effective on and after July 1, 1975, attached Appendices[6] A, B, C, F–1, and M–1 supersede the corresponding appendices attached to Order 74–12–119, dated December 30, 1974; and attached appendices[6] A, I, I–B, I–C, and L supersede appendices I–A, I, I–B, I–C, and L attached to Order 74–12–120, dated December 30, 1974;

2. The subsidy due and payable to each carrier on and after July 1, 1975,[7] shall be computed on the basis of the daily subsidy rate set forth for each carrier in Appendix L (Third Revised) to this order;

3. This order shall become effective on the seventh day after service hereof, unless prior to that date exceptions, together with supporting reasons, shall have been filed with the Board by any party to this proceeding. If exceptions and supporting reasons are filed by any party within the prescribed time, the effective date of this order shall be stayed only for the party or parties filing exceptions pending further action by the Board; and

4. This order shall be served upon all parties to this proceeding.

This order will be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

By the Civil Aeronautics Board:

[SEAL] EDWIN Z. HOLLAND,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.75-18702 Filed 7-17-75;8:45 am]

HAWAIIAN AIRLINES, INC.

[Docket 27612]

Hearing

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, that a hearing in the above-entitled proceeding will be held on August 12, 1975, at 9 a.m. (local time) in Court Room No. 1, United States Court House in Honolulu, Hawaii before Administrative Law Judge Burton S. Kolko.

For information concerning the issues involved and other details in this proceeding, interested persons are referred to the prehearing conference report served on June 2, 1975, and other documents which are in the docket of this proceeding on file in the Docket Section of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Dated at Washington, D.C., July 14, 1975.

[SEAL] BURTON S. KOLKO,
Administrative Law Judge.

[FR Doc.75-18698 Filed 7-17-75;8:45 am]

MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Meeting

Notice is hereby given that a briefing will be made by the Maryland Department of Transportation on July 31, 1975, at 10:00 a.m., in Room 1027, Universal Building, 1825 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., on the development of the Baltimore-Washington International Airport since its dedication five years ago.

Dated at Washington, D.C., July 15, 1975.

[SEAL] EDWIN Z. HOLLAND,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.75-18699 Filed 7-17-75;8:45 am]

[Order 75-7-62; Docket 28073]

ALLEGHENY AIRLINES, INC.

Investigation and Suspension

Adopted by the Civil Aeronautics Board at its office in Washington, D.C. on the 30th day of June, 1975.

By tariff revisions[1] marked to become effective July 1, 1975, Allegheny Airlines, Inc. (Allegheny) proposes to extend its individual inclusive tour excursion fares (IT) in 22 trans-border markets (all over 200 miles in distance) from the current expiration date of July 15, 1975 to July 15, 1976. The fares which became effective December 15, 1974, offer a discount of 20 percent from normal jet custom and propeller class fares, are restricted to round-trip travel, and are available only between midnight Friday and midnight Sunday.

Allegheny has justified extension of its trans-border fares simultaneously with similar domestic IT fares, and it is not clear whether the data provided in that justification included the results in its trans-border service.[2] In any event, it concedes that only a small number of passengers used the trans-border fares. The carrier concedes a disappointingly low level of traffic generation, which it alleges resulted from the fact that promotional travel brochures had already been printed by travel wholesalers and retailers for last year's peak summer and fall travel periods and that the program was therefore unknown to many potential passengers. Because of the low level of usage, there are allegedly "no meaningful data upon which to reach definitive conclusions regarding the economics of the program;" a December, 1974 in-flight survey indicated less than one percent of the sample represented IT passengers. It is contended that an additional year's extension is necessary to determine the "ultimate value" of the program, although no estimate as to its expected financial effect has been provided.

Complaints have been filed by American Airlines, Inc. (American), Northwest Airlines, Inc. (Northwest) and Trans World Airlines, Inc. (TWA). All three carriers argue that the lack of traffic response to the fare is sufficient to call for suspension, and allege that Allegheny's attempt to refile a promotional fare which has failed to generate traffic flies in the face of the Board's attempt to eliminate useless promotional fares. TWA characterizes the tariff as "junk" fares that "clutter" the tariff pages. It is contended that Allegheny's fares have clearly been a failure in generating additional traffic and that Allegheny's stated reason for this failure is "absurd." TWA also argues, in addition, that the existence of more promotional fares in the markets involved at this time makes it likely that there would be even less response to the IT fare this year than last.

Allegheny has answered the complaints, largely reiterating its previous support for continuation of the fares and contending that the complainants have provided no reasonable basis for terminating the experiment at this time. It stresses the insufficient data base upon which to reach any meaningful judgment concerning the economic merits of the program as the primary reason for continuing it for another year. Finally, Allegheny notes that tour-basing fares are not unique to its system and that, in view of the relatively low usage, it is reasonably certain that the fares have not had a significant diversionary impact on other carriers.

Upon consideration of all relevant matters, the Board has concluded that extension of the proposed fares may be unjust, or unreasonable, or unjustly discriminatory, or unduly preferential, or unduly prejudicial, or otherwise unlawful, and should be investigated. The Board further concludes that these fares should be suspended pending investigation.

When these transborder IT fares were previously before the Board, it was argued by dissenting members Minetti and West that they should not be suspended in any of the markets in which they were proposed—a position subsequently upheld by the President on foreign policy grounds (See Order 74–12–94 and attachments thereto). The present situation, however, is quite different. The Board has always held the view that a carrier seeking to renew discount fares should furnish a detailed justification

[5] This order is not intended to disturb the service mail rates established pursuant to other orders of the Board.

[6] Appendices were filed as part of the original document.

[7] The profit offset from ineligible services and the eligible improvement or deficiency as determined herein are effective from July 1, 1975, through December 31, 1975.

[1] Revisions to Airline Tariff Publishers Company, Inc., Agent, Tariff C.A.B. No. 249.

[2] Allegheny reported that through March 1975, 2,319 passengers used the IT fares, which resulted in a net positive profit impact of $7,056, based on an assumed generation of 40 percent.

based on its experience with them, and this Allegheny has not done. Indeed, from the data Allegheny has provided, it would appear that this particular fare experiment has not been successful. It has not been shown to have lowered the cost of air transportation between the United States and Canada, and no persuasive reason is offered why it should be continued.

Since these fares were first proposed a number of discount fares have been introduced which offer the air traveller various options for low cost travel in the markets involved. Thus, the suspension of these fares should have little adverse impact on the consumer. In view of this, it does not appear necessary in the public interest that unproductive discount fares should continue to clutter up the tariffs indefinitely. In fact, with the new promotional fares now available on Allegheny's system, generation from the IT fare would very likely be even less in the future that it has been in the past year. The carrier's pleadings do not disclose that the carrier or tour operators have any plans to develop IT traffic, or that the carrier has made any study or survey of traffic potential.[4] Moreover, due to the extremely limited volume of traffic involved, and with alternative discount fares now available, we foresee little if any adverse inflationary impact as a result of suspension.

Accordingly, pursuant to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, and particularly sections 204, 403, 404, and 1002 thereof,

It is ordered that:

1. An investigation be instituted to determine whether the provisions of Reference Marks "e", insofar as they apply to the SWE5 and YWE5 class fares from or to points in Canada, on 2nd Revised Page 54, 9th and 10th Revised Pages 128, 4th Revised Page 231, 7th and 8th Revised Pages 299 and 6th and 7th Revised Pages 646 to C.A.B. No. 249 issued by Airline Tariff Publishing Company, Agent, and practices affecting such provisions, are or will be unjust, unreasonable, unjustly discriminatory, unduly preferential, unduly prejudicial, or otherwise unlawful, and, if found to be unlawful, to take appropriate action to prevent the use of such provisions or rules, regulations, or practices;

2. Pending hearing and decision by the Board, the provisions on the tariff pages specified in paragraph 1 above are suspended and their use deferred to and including July 14, 1976 unless otherwise ordered by the Board, and that no changes be made therein during the period of suspension except by order or special permission of the Board;

3. This order shall be submitted to the President[4] and shall become effective July 11, 1975;

4. The investigation ordered herein be assigned for hearing before an Administrative Law Judge of the Board at a time and place hereafter to be designated; and

5. Copies of this order be served upon Allegheny Airlines, Inc., American Airlines, Inc., Delta Air Lines, Inc., Eastern Air Lines, Inc., Northwest Airlines, Inc., Trans World Airlines, Inc., and United Air Lines, Inc., which are hereby made parties to this proceeding.

This order will be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

By the Civil Aeronautics Board:

[SEAL] EDWIN Z. HOLLAND,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.75-18700 Filed 7-17-75;8:45 am]

[Order 75-7-61, Dockets 27959, 27993, 27701]

KOREAN AIR LINES CO., LTD.

Investigation

Adopted by the Civil Aeronautics Board at its office in Washington, D.C. on the 14th day of July, 1975.

Korean Air Lines Co., Ltd. (KAL) has filed tariff revisions, effective July 11, 1975, proposing new 14/90-day group excursion fares from points in the U.S. to Seoul.[1] The fares, proposed pursuant to instruction from the Government of the Republic of Korea, are intended to enable Koreans residing in the United States and Korean War veterans to visit Korea on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of Korean Independence and the 25th anniversary of the Korean War; to permit KAL to compete with similar fares in effect from the United States to Manila and Taipei; and to aid in the general promotion and development of Korean tourism. The initial tariff filing has since been revised to increase the minimum stay period to 30 days.

By telegraphic complaint filed June 17, 1975, Northwest Airlines, Inc. (Northwest) requests that the proposed fares be suspended and investigated on the ground that the 14-day minimum-stay period is unduly liberal and poses a serious potential for diversion from normal-fare traffic. In a late complaint filed June 23, 1975, Pan American World Airways, Inc. (Pan American) likewise requests suspension or at the very least investigation of the proposed fares. The carrier contends the Korean fares undercut every fare in the U.S.-Korea market except the IATA GIT and affinity group (70) fares; that revenue from the proposed fares would not cover the cost of carriage at anticipated load factors in the U.S.-Korea market; and that the fares cannot be expected to generate new traffic.

Northwest's complaint has been effectively mooted by KAL's increase in the minimum stay period from 14 to 30 days. Thus, the proposed fares are identical to the government-ordered group fares presently available to destinations in the Philippine Islands and the Republic of China.[2] The only remaining issue raised by the complaints, therefore, is Pan American's contention that the group fares are uneconomic. The Board has determined to dismiss the complaint insofar as it seeks suspension on the basis that the proposed U.S.-Seoul fares, which produce a yield averaging 12 percent more than that derived from the similar group fares to Manila and Taipei, represent a legitimate competitive response on the part of KAL. However, the same potential for significant yield erosion exists here and, for this reason, we are ordering their investigation and consolidation with that instituted by Orders 75-5-61 and 75-5-114.

Accordingly, pursuant to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, and particularly sections 204(a), 403, and 1002(j) thereof,

It is ordered that:

1. An investigation be instituted to determine whether the fares and provisions set forth in the tariff pages in the Appendix hereto, and all subsequent revisions thereto, and rules, regulations and practices affecting such fares and provisions, are or will be unjust, unreasonable, unjustly discriminatory, unduly preferential, unduly prejudicial, or otherwise unlawful, and, if found to be unlawful, to take appropriate action to prevent the use of such fares and provisions or rules, regulations, or practices;

2. The investigation ordered herein be and hereby is consolidated into that instituted by Order 75-5-61 in Docket 27701 which is designated *Pacific Group Fares Investigation;*

3. Except to the extent granted herein, the complaints of Northwest Airlines, Inc. and Pan American World Airways, Inc., in Dockets 27959 and 27993 be and hereby are dismissed; and

4. Copies of this order be served upon Korean Air Lines Co., Ltd., which is hereby made a party to Docket 27701, and upon Northwest Airlines, Inc., and Pan American World Airways, Inc.

This order will be published in the Federal Register.

By the Civil Aeronautics Board:

[SEAL] EDWIN Z. HOLLAND,
Secretary.

---

[4] We do not find persuasive the fact that other carriers maintain tour-basing fares. These fares are generally successful in markets which are heavily vacation oriented. Allegheny's system is not of this character, a fact which in our judgment explains the lack of success of the fare.

[4] This order was transmitted to the President on July 2, 1975.

[1] Air Tariffs Corporation, Agent, Tariff C.A.B. No. 44, 22nd Revised Page 309 and Rule No. 297.

[2] The U.S.-Philippines fares, which have been available since 1973, were recently extended by government order through February 29, 1976. The Board adopted an order suspending the extension, but the Board's action was disapproved by the President and the Board subsequently ordered an investigation of the fares. Order 75-5-61 (May 16, 1975). The U.S.-Republic of China fares have been available since May 23, 1975 and were set for investigation by Order 75-5-114 (May 28, 1975).

APPENDIX

Passenger Fares Tariff No. PF-4, C.A.B. No. 44
Issued by Air Tariffs Corporation, Agent
On 8th Revised Page 82-G, Rule 297
On 22nd Revised Page 309, Table 121

[FR Doc.75-18701 Filed 7-17-75;8:45 am]

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

COLORADO STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Agenda and Notice of Open Meeting

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the Rules and Regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, that a planning meeting of the Colorado State Advisory Committee (SAC) to this Commission will convene at 8 a.m. on August 23, 1975, at the Quality Inn Motel, 1840 Sherman Street, Denver, Colorado 80203.

Persons wishing to attend this meeting should contact the Committee Chairman, or the Mountain States Regional Office of the Commission, Room 216, 1726 Champa Street, Denver, Colorado 80202.

The purpose of this meeting is to review and discuss the legal section of the Medical/Legal Access Project Report.

This meeting will be conducted pursuant to the rules and regulations of the Commission.

Dated at Washington, D.C., July 14, 1975.

ISAIAH T. CRESWELL, JR.,
Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc.75-18707 Filed 7-17-75;8:45 am]

MARYLAND STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Agenda and Notice of Open Meeting

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the Rules and Regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, that a planning meeting of the Maryland State Advisory Committee (SAC) to this Commission will convene at 8 p.m. on August 4, 1975, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

Persons wishing to attend this meeting should contact the Commission Chairperson, or the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office of the Commission, Room 510, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

The purpose of this meeting is to: (1) Review data for Maryland S&L's institutions, (2) Review draft project proposal, (3) Identify potential interviews for Maryland S&L hearing.

This meeting will be conducted pursuant to the rules and regulations of the Commission.

Dated at Washington, D.C., July 15, 1975.

ISAIAH T. CRESWELL, JR.,
Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc.75-18708 Filed 7-17-75;8:45 am]

MICHIGAN STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Agenda and Notice of Open Meeting

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, that a planning meeting of the Michigan State Advisory Committee (SAC) to this Commission will convene at 1:30 p.m. on August 8, 1975, at Bergstein Room, Main Building, Delta College, University Center, Michigan 48710.

Persons wishing to attend this meeting should contact the Committee Chairperson or the Midwestern Regional Office of the Commission, Room 1428, 230 South Dearborn Street, 32nd Floor, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

The purpose of this meeting is to: (1) Review material for inclusion in report of the committee's June hearing on Model Cities phase-outs, (2) Continue plans for the committee's third community development hearing, (3) Other old and new business.

This meeting will be conducted pursuant to the rules and regulations of the Commission.

Dated at Washington, D.C., July 15, 1975.

ISAIAH T. CRESWELL, JR.,
Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc.75-18709 Filed 7-17-75;8:45 am]

NEW MEXICO STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Agenda and Notice of Open Meeting

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, that a press conference of the New Mexico State Advisory Committee (SAC) to this Commission will convene at 10 a.m. on August 13, 1975 at the Airport Marina Hotel 2910 Yale Blvd. SE, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87119.

Persons wishing to attend this meeting should contact the Committee Chairman, or the Southwestern Regional Office of the Commission, Room 231, New Moore Building, 106 Broadway, San Antonio, Texas 78205.

The purpose of this press conference is to release Farmington Report.

This meeting will be conducted pursuant to the rules and regulations of the Commission.

Dated at Washington, D.C., July 15, 1975.

ISAIAH T. CRESWELL, JR.,
Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc.75-18710 Filed 7-17-75;8:45 am]

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

Availability

Environmental impact statements received by the Council on Environmental Quality from July 7th through July 11, 1975. The date of receipt for each statement is noted in the statement summary. Under Council Guidelines the *minimum* period for public review and comment on draft environmental impact statements in forty-five (45) days from this FEDERAL REGISTER notice of availability. (September 1, 1975) The thirty (30) day period for each final statement begins on the day the statement is made available to the Council and to commenting parties.

Copies of individual statements are available for review from the originating agency. Back copies will also be available at cost from the Environmental Law Institute, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Contact: Dr. Fowden G. Maxwell, Coordinator of Environmental Quality Activities, Office of the Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Room 359-A, Washington, D.C. 20250, 202-447-3965.

FOREST SERVICE

Draft

Willamette N.F., Land Use and Timber Management, Oregon and Washington, July 10: The statement considers five alternatives for the land use and timber management plans for the 1,700,000 acre Willamette National Forest. Each of the plans emphasizes development of one or more aspects of the land. Adverse impacts depend entirely upon the alternative(s) chosen. (ELR Order No. 50992.)

Shoshone N.F. Timber Management Plan, several counties in Wyoming, July 10: The statement concerns the revision of the 1963 Timber Plan for the Shoshone National Forest. It recommends forest management of 2,160 acres of land annually. Less than one percent of the Forest will be treated in the ten years. Timber management will change the appearance of the landscape, and road construction would result. (ELR Order No. 50991.)

Final

Kelly-Bullion Unit, Nezperce N.F., Idaho County, Idaho, July 10: Proposed is the implementation of management guidance for the 39,100 acre Kelly-Bullion Planning Unit of the Nezperce National Forest. Management on the various management units will be directed towards wildlife, backcounty, recreational mining, timber or forage values; 20,057 acres will be placed under intensive timber management. The roadless and scenic qualities of the Salmon River Breaks and the Wind River Area will be protected under the plan. There will be adverse impact to soil and wildlife habitat. Comments made by: EPA and DOI. (ELR Order No. 50989.)

Final

Deschutes, Fremont, Ochoco, Winema N.F.'s, Herbicide, several counties in Oregon, July 8: The statement concerns the use of amitrole, atrazine, dalapon, dicamba, 2,4, 5-T, 2,4-D, silvex, and picloram on the following National Forests: Deschutes, Fremont, Ochoco, and Winema. The use of these chemicals will put herbicide residues into the environment in varying amounts, depending upon the chemical used. The killing of some non-target species and the hazard of an altered habitat to wildlife are among the adverse impacts of vegetation management. Comments made by: HEW, DOI, and state agencies. (ELR Order No. 50984.)

Huckleberry Planning Unit, Mt. Hood N.F., Clackamas County, Oreg., July 8: The statement analyzes a proposed land use management plan for the 30,000 acre Huckleberry Planning Unit, Zigzag Ranger District, Mt. Hood National Forest. The unit contains 20,800 acres of roadless areas. The unit would be divided into 4 management areas for such uses as timber and water production, recreation, grazing, and wildlife habitat; Unit D would be managed for backcountry and road-

less recreation, and would remain in an essentially unchanged natural condition. There will be adverse impact to air, water, and soil qualities from timber harvest and road construction, and increased recreational use (91 pages). Comments made by: AMP, USDA, COE, HUD, DOI, FPC, EPA, USCG, state agencies, other organizations and individuals. (ELR Order No. 50985.)

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Draft

Big Cajun No. 2 Power Station, Pointe Coupee County, La., July 7: This project involves the construction of a new 1080-megawatt coal-fired generating station on the Mississippi River near New Roads, Louisiana. The station will consist two 540 megawatt steam generating units and switching yards for related transmission. Adverse impacts include the release of some sulfur and nitrogen oxides and particulate matter into the atmosphere, removal of 1,714 acres of pasture land from agricultural productivity, increased noise levels, slightly increased incidence of fogging, increased large traffic on the river, the discharge of liquid wastes into the river, increased coal mining, and temporary construction disruption (43 pages). (ELR Order No. 50978.)

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Final

East Franklin Watershed, Franklin, Catahoula, and Richland Counties, July 7: The statement refers to the construction of the East Franklin Watershed Project. The project is for watershed protection, flood prevention, and drainage in Franklin, Catahoula, and Richland Parishes, Louisiana. Approximately 186 miles of channel work with appurtenant measures, construction of 28 structures for water control, and measures to minimize adverse effects to fish and wildlife will be installed. Adverse impacts are loss of wildlife habitat, sedimentation and turbidity during construction, and increased temperatures on ponded areas. Comments made by: DOT, EPA, AHP, HEW, DOI, USCG, and COE. (ELR Order No. 50971.)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

ARMY CORPS

Contact: Mr. Francis X. Kelly, Director, Office of Public Affairs, Attn: DAEN-PAP, Office of the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D.C. 20314, 202-693-6861.

Draft

Brunswick Harbor Improvement, Glynn County, Ga., July 7: The project provides for improvements to Brunswick Harbor, Georgia including deepening East River and associated entrance channels, enlarging the existing turning basin and maneuver area, and constructing two channels and a turning basin. Adverse impacts associated with this project are loss of plankton and benthic organisms during dredging and temporary increases in turbidity and suspended solids (Savannah District). (ELR Order No. 50973.)

Altamaha, Oconee and Ocmulgee Rivers, Snagging, several counties in Georgia, July 11: The proposed action is the maintenance of the channels in the Altamaha, Oconee, and Ocumulgee Rivers. The project will consist of selective clearing and snagging by snagging vessels within the 60 to 100 foot wide channel along a total stream length of 474 miles for purposes of continued recreation and navigation. Adverse impacts include the reduction in potential fish habitat and encouragement of continued use by power boats (Savannah District). (ELR Order No. 51002.)

Kings Bay Military Ocean Terminal, Permit, Camden County, Ga., July 11: Proposed is the granting of a permit for maintenance dredging of the turning basin and entrance channel serving Kings Bay Military Ocean Terminal in Kings Bay, Cumberland Sound, for the purpose of facilitating safe access to regular deep-water channels, thereby sustaining the standby mobilization status of the ocean terminal. Dredging will cause an increase in suspended solids and turbidity. Disposal operations will alter present habitats existing on disposal sites, cause some displacement of animal and bird species utilizing disposal sites, and produce adverse impact upon the visual aesthetics and/or scenic value of Cumberland Island (National Seashore designation) (Savannah District). (ELR Order No. 51003.)

Elk Creek Lake, several counties in Oregon, July 8: Proposed is the construction and operation of Elk Creek Lake, a component of the Rogue River Basin Project, for purposes of flood control, fish and wildlife enhancement, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation, recreation, area redevelopment, and water quality control. Construction of the dam and reservoir would have the following adverse effects: inundation of about 1,200 acres of land; destruction of vegetation and wildlife populations currently inhabiting the reservoir site; and the alteration of the natural environment by the addition of a man-made earth and rock embankment, landscaped visitor facilities, and a large body of water (Portland District). (ELR Order No. 50980.)

Final

Keweenaw Waterway, Houghton County, Michigan, July 10: The proposed action is the continued operation and maintenance of the Kenweenay Waterway. This activity includes breakwater and revetment repair, dredging, and dredge material disposal. Adverse impacts include increased turbidity, disruptions and covering of benthic dwelling organisms during dredging operation, and the effects of open-lake disposal into Lake Superior (St. Paul District). Comments made by: EPA, USDA, COE, HEW, DOI, and USCG. (ELR Order No. 50990.)

Chartiers Creek Local Flood Protection Project, Washington and Allegheny Counties, Pa., July 9: The statement refers to the continuation and completion of a flood protection project consisting of two independent projects involving the widening, deepening, and realignment of Chartiers Creek through 4.8 miles in the Canonsburg-Houston area of Washington County and 11.2 miles in the Carnegie-Bridgeville area of Allegheny County. Adverse impacts are long-term loss of wildlife habitat, and increased noise, air, and water pollution (Pittsburgh District). Comments made by: DOC, USDA, EPA, DOI, state, and local agencies. (ELR Order No. 50986.)

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Contact: Mr. Andrew E. Kauders, Executive Director of Environmental Affairs, General Services Administration, 18th and F Streets NW., Washington, D.C. 20405, 202-343-4161

Draft

Fort Holabird Disposal, Baltimore County, Md., July 10: The action consists of the disposal of 226.85 acres of Fort Holabird, Baltimore City as follows: approximately 179.20 acres through negotiated sale with the City of Baltimore, approximately 37 acres by assignment to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation for conveyance to the City of Baltimore for park and recreation purposes, approximately 4 acres by assignment to BOR for conveyance to Baltimore County, and approximately 6.65 acres through Sealed Bid Sale. Adverse effects to the environment would result from increase in noise, emission pollutants due to increased traffic, increase in sewage, water, and other utilities including solid waste disposal. (ELR Order No. 50988.)

Federal Youth Center, Bastrop County, Texas, July 7: The project consists of construction of 145,000 square feet of space for a Federal Youth Center to be operated by the Bureau of Prisons near the city of Bastrop, Texas. Adverse impacts include minor increases in traffic volume and noise at the site, slight degradation of air quality due to the increased traffic, and temporary construction disruption (167 pages). (ELR Order No. 50977.)

Final

Border Patrol Sector Headquarters, Marfa, Presido County, Tex., July 7: Proposed is the construction of a 4-building, 29,000 square foot complex to house the operation of the Border Patrol, a branch of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. The complex will include facilities for vehicle repair and storage and a parking lot for 35 vehicles. The existing buildings on the 8.2-acre site will be used until completion of the new facility, and then removed. Construction disruption will result. Comments made by: DOT, AHP, COE, HEW, EPA, DOI, and USDA. (ELR Order No. 50974.)

DEPARTMENT OF HUD

Contact: Mr. Richard H. Broun, Director, Office of Environmental Quality, Room 7258, 451 7th Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20410, 202-755-6308.

Draft

Osceola Water Treatment Plant Improvements, Missis'ippi County, Ark., July 7: The proposed project is the renovation of existing facilities to double the capacity of the present 1.5 MCD Osceola water treatment plant. Project construction will cause temporary community disruption. Operation of the plant will result in the possibility of surface water quality degradation from sewage sludge lagoon overflow and of ground water quality degradation from sewage sludge lagoon seepage. (ELR Order No. 50976.)

Final

Seminola NDP Area (No. 1), Dade County, Fla., July 10: The statement is the first of eight statements concerning the Dade County Neighborhood Development Program. The program is currently in its fifth year of execution proposing urban renewal in eight areas. Relocation of families and individuals is largely accomplished. There will be construction disruption. (ELR Order No. 50994.)

Edison Park NDP Area (No. 2), Dade County, Fla., July 10. (ELR Order No. 50995.)

Central NDP Area (No. 3), Dade County, Fla., July 10. (ELR Order No. 50996.)

Coconut Grove NDP Area (No. 4), Dade County, Fla., July 10. (ELR Order No. 50997.)

South Miami NDP Area (No. 6), Dade County, Fla., July 10. (ELR Order No. 50998.)

Perrine NDP Area (No. 7), Dade County, Fla., July 10. (ELR Order No. 50999.)

Goulds NDP Area (No. 8), Dade County, Fla., July 10. (ELR Order No. 51000.)

The Model City Area (Area No. 9), Dade County, Fla., July 10. (ELR Order No. 51001).

The following are Community Development Block Grant statements prepared and circulated directly by applicants pursuant to section 104(h) of the 1974 Housing and Community Development Act. Copies may be obtained from the office of the appropriate local chief executive. (Copies are not available from HUD).

SECTION 104(H)

Draft

Williamson Creek Sewer Line, Texas, July 8: Proposed is the installation of a sewer trunk line to serve northeastern Temple, including a presently undeveloped area proposed for residential development. The project will encourage development in northeast Temple. Construction disruption will result. (ELR Order No. 50981.)

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

Contact: Mr. Bruce Blanchard, Director, Environmental Project Review, Room 7260, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240, 202-343-3891.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Draft

Increased Leasing, 10 Million Acres, OCS, July 11: Proposed is the acceleration of Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas leasing in the years 1975 through 1978 by conducting six lease sales each year, including lease sales in some or all frontier areas by 1978. Many of these areas have little or no history of OCS oil and gas development. The possible environmental impacts of such an increase are examined and several scenarios are presented by which this proposal could be affected (3 volumes). (ELR Order No. 51004.)

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Contact: Mr. Martin Convisser, Director, Office of Environmental Affairs, 400 7th Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20590, 202-426-4357.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

Draft

Detroit-Wayne Co. Airport, Runway (Supplement), Wayne County, Mich., July 9: The statement is to supplement an eis filed with CEQ 10 April 1974. The specific issues addressed consist of those in the opinion of the US District Court, Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division. Data is included to rectify the omission of information in the statement which the court found misleading. The minimum review period of this draft supplement shall be thirty days from July 9, 1975 (August 8, 1975). (ELR Order No. 50987.)

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

Draft

U.S. 56, Kauai Belt Road, Hanalei to Kalihiwai, Kauai County, Hawaii, July 8: The project entails the realignment and widening to 2 lanes of a 3.5 mile segment of Kuhio Highway (FAP 56) located in the Hanalei District, Island of Kauai. Adverse environmental impacts include the displacement of 0 to 4 homes, increased noise along the route, increased nitrogen oxide emissions, the removal of as many as 6 large trees and several smaller trees, and temporary construction disruption (106 pages). (ELR Order No. 50979.)

KY 80 (Somerset-London Road), Pulaski and Laurel Counties, Ky., July 7: The proposed construction of KY 80, 1 4-lane highway, begins near Rockcastle River (Pulaski County) and terminates 4.3 miles eastward near existing KY 80 and Bernstadt (Laurel County). Adverse effects include increased noise levels along the new route, loss of 140 acres of wildlife habitat and some vegetation, displacement of 1 to 4 homes, limited erosion and sedimentation during construction, and temporary construction disruption. (ELR Order No. 50975.)

Draft

U.S. 31-E, Allen County, Ky., July 8: Proposed is the relocation of a portion of U.S. 31-E from 2.2 miles North of the Tennessee State line to the point of intersection with U.S. 231 near the West City Limits of Scottsville. Negative impacts of the reconstruction of the 6.42 mile segment include the disruption and relocation of homes and businesses, grave relocations, hampered traffic movements during construction, and disruption of sanitary facilities. The project may also cause an increase in air and noise pollution. (ELR Order No. 50982.)

Salem-Peabody Connector Road and Bridge, Essex County, Mass., July 10: Proposed is the construction of a new arterial roadway through Peabody and Salem paralleling Lowell, Main, Boston, and Bridge Streets and directly linking the Northshore communities in the area with Route 128. Two alternatives are considered. The project will displace 5 to 8 houses and 19 to 21 businesses. Construction disruption and noise and air pollution will result. (ELR Order No. 50993.)

Appalachian Corridor "H", Lorentz to Elkins, Upshur, Barhour, and Randolph Counties, W. Va., July 9: The statement concerns three consecutive west to east segments of Corridor "H" of the Appalachian Development Highway System. The entire project will run for 25.4 miles and will be divided with two lanes in each direction. The project will displace 19 businesses and 48 families and will require several stream relocations and adjustments. The improvement in accessibility to this area which the proposed projects will provide should attract new industry to the area and stimulate the growth of existing industries and businesses. (ELR Order No. 50983.)

Final

Poughkeepsie East-West Arterial and SH 549, Dutchess County, N.Y., July 7: The proposed project is the construction of the Poughkeepsie East-West Arterial and Poughkeepsie-Pleasant Valley, S.H. 549 to complete the arterial. Arterial length is 5.75 miles. The project will displace 38 businesses and 271 families. A 4(f) review has been filed to obtain land from five public/private owned park/recreation areas. An increase in air, noise and water pollution will occur (101 pages). Comments made by: USDA, DOC, HEW, FPC, EPA, COE, DOT, DOI, state, county, regional, and local agencies (ELR Order No. 50972.)

GARY L. WIDMAN,
General Counsel.

[FR Doc.75-18654 Filed 7-17-75;8:45 am]

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

TRESPASSING ON ADMINISTRATION PROPERTY

Burlington Plant; Revocation of Notices

The notice with respect to the Burlington Plant dated October 12, 1965 appearing at pages 13276 and 13277 of the Federal Register of October 19, 1965 (F.R. Doc. 65-11090) and the notice with respect to the Security Communications Systems (SECOM) Site dated November 30, 1972 appearing at page 26053 of the Federal Register of December 7, 1972 (F.R. Doc. 72-20970) are revoked as of June 28, 1975.

Dated at Washington, D.C. this 30th day of June, 1975.

ALFRED D. STARBIRD,
Assistant Administrator for National Security.

[FR Doc.75-18832 Filed 7-17-75;8:45 am]

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL 396-2]

CALIFORNIA STATE MOTOR VEHICLE POLLUTION CONTROL STANDARDS

Waiver of Federal Preemption

I. *Introduction.* On May 8, 1975, the Environmental Protection Agency, by notice published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (40 FR 20130), announced a public hearing pursuant to section 209(b) of the Clean Air Act (the "Act") as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857f-6a(a), 81 Stat. 501, Pub. L. 91-604). That hearing was called to consider a request by the State of California that the Administrator waive application of section 209(a) of the Act with respect to the California evaporative hydrocarbon emission standard and accompanying SHED (Sealed Housing for Evaporative Determinations) test procedure applicable to 1977 and subsequent model year light duty motor vehicles. Section 209(b) of the Act requires the Administrator to grant such waiver, after public hearing, unless he finds that the State of California does not require standards more stringent than applicable Federal standards to meet compelling and extraordinary conditions, or that such State standards and accompanying enforcement procedures are not consistent with section 202(a) of the Act. State standards and enforcement procedures are deemed to be consistent with section 202(a) if adequate technology exists with which to meet them, if adequate lead time is available in which to implement that technology, and if the accompanying enforcement procedures are consistent with the Federal procedures.

The public hearing was held in Los Angeles, California, on May 28, 1975. The record was kept open until June 6, 1975, for the submission of written material, data or arguments by interested persons.

I have determined that the statutory criteria of section 209(b) of the Act have not been met, and therefore that I must deny the requested waiver of Federal preemption. The record of the hearing and the other evidence available to me clearly establish that although compelling and extraordinary conditions exist in the State of California, adequate technology exists with which to meet the standard and the accompanying enforcement procedures are consistent with Federal procedures, there is insufficient lead time available in which to apply that technology to the 1977 model year California vehicles. However, I have also determined that sufficient lead time does exist in which to apply that technology to the 1978 model year, and therefore I am today granting a waiver of Federal preemption to California for its evaporative emission standard and SHED test procedure for the 1978 and subsequent model years, to the extent that a Federal standard of equal or greater stringency is not subsequently established for any such model year.

In addition, the hearing record clearly reveals a high probability that the auto industry could meet an evaporative emission standard based on the SHED test not just in California, but nation-wide, by the 1978 model year. Accordingly, in view of the very substantial emission control benefits that would be realized by such an approach, and the desirability of a uniform national standard, I am pledging EPA's best efforts to establish such a standard at the Federal level for 1978, rather than for 1979 as I had previously announced.

II. *Background.* In order to place the decision I am rendering today in proper perspective, I believe that it is appropriate to briefly recall the past history of evaporative emission control.

The State of California took an early interest in the evaporative hydrocarbon emission problem. In November of 1966, the California Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board (MVPCB) proposed interim standards to achieve an 80% reduction of baseline evaporative emissions from uncontrolled vehicles. The proposed test procedure involved a "carbon trap" approach whereby the vapors from specific sources on the vehicle would be collected by attaching charcoal canisters to those points. This proposal never took effect, for three months later in February of 1967 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) issued proposed evaporative emission standards. The Federal proposal included a "SHED" test procedure which involved placing the vehicle inside a sealed enclosure to measure the total diurnal and hot soak emissions from all sources.[1] However, that procedure had not been substantiated by quantitative data at that time, and was replaced by essentially the same procedure as had been proposed earlier by the MVPCB. That procedure, as revised after comments, was published as a Federal regulation on June 4, 1968 (33 FR 8304). A 6 g/test standard was made applicable to the 1971 model year nationwide, while the MVPCB adopted it for the 1970 model year. Subsequently, the standard was lowered to 2 g/test for 1972 vehicles nationwide, and the Federal evaporative regulations have remained unchanged since that time.

However, work on the use of a sealed enclosure to measure evaporative emissions continued even after a different approach had been chosen for regulatory purposes. The refinements in the procedure which resulted from this work led to the publishing in July of 1972 by the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) of a formal recommended test procedure, SAE J171(a), entitled, "Measurement of Fuel Evaporative Emissions Using the Enclosure Technique."

During 1972, the effectiveness of the carbon trap procedure for determining evaporative emissions became suspect. Concern on this point was triggered by the questionable (i.e., unrealistically low[1]) evaporative measurements which were being recorded by the carbon trap procedure during EPA certification tests. These results led to the adoption by EPA of the SAE J171(a) procedure for use in a program to measure the actual evaporative emissions from vehicles in use.[2] In that program comparative tests were conducted on both controlled and uncontrolled vehicles (1957–1971 model years). From the results of that and the next two years' surveillance programs, it became clear the carbon trap procedure is inadequate for measuring the actual evaporative emissions of a vehicle, for the data revealed only a marginal improvement in evaporative emissions (particularly hot soak losses) between the uncontrolled and the controlled vehicles. Yet those same "uncontrolled" vehicles had been certified to extremely low levels of evaporative emissions. Clearly, neither the control systems to reduce evaporative emissions nor the test procedure employed to measure that reduction is adequate for the task assigned to it.

Based on these EPA test results, the California Air Resources Board (ARB) initiated its own surveillance program in early 1975. The results of their testing of both controlled and uncontrolled vehicles (model years 1964 through 1975), were consistent with the findings of the earlier EPA studies. The ARB on April 16, 1975, therefore adopted an evaporative emission standard of 6 g/test of hydrocarbons applicable to the 1977 and subsequent model years, as measured by the SHED technique (SAE J171(a), with modifications), and on April 23, 1975, requested a waiver of Federal preemption for this standard and test procedure. It is that waiver request which is the subject of this decision.

III. *Discussion*—1. *The Merits of the SHED Test.* No manufacturer denied that the SHED test is technically superior to the present (carbon trap) method of measuring evaporative emissions. A table setting forth the Los Angeles area results of the surveillance programs described above will show just how great that superiority is.

Model year	Shed results					Canister results	
	Diurnal (grams per phase)	Hot soak (grams per phase)	Total (grams per test)	Grams per mile equivalent	Percent improvement	Certification standard (grams per test)	Average level (grams per test)
1957 to 1969	26	15	41	2.8	0	None	
1970 to 1971	18	12	30	2.1	25	6	
1972	14	12	26	2.0	28	2	
1973	16	15	31	2.5	11	2	0.5
1978 (Calif.)	[1] 1	[1] 5	[2] 6	.7	75		

[1] Estimated.
[2] Standard.

The table shows that the "controlled" vehicles tested gave results of from 26 to 31 g/test, although they had been certified to either a 6 or a 2 g/test standard, as measured by the canister method. Furthermore, the results for 1973, the only year in which comparison canister tests were performed on the in-use vehicles, show that those vehicles gave an average evaporative emission level of only .5 g/test, well within the 2 g/test standard, when tested by the canister method, even though the SHED test results averaged 31 g/test.

The table also illustrates how ineffective the current control systems are in reducing evaporative emissions. Through the use of a formula[1] for relating g/test to g/mi, these data indicate that only an 11–28 percent improvement in emissions has been achieved by the vehicles with those systems, while an improvement of more than 90–95 percent was sought. In addition, it can be estimated that the potential hydrocarbon emission levels achievable by the imposition of a 6 gram SHED test standard would be about 0.7 g/mi, which represents a reduction in the range of 1.3–1.8 g/mi—substantially greater than the difference between the current Federal exhaust emission standard of 1.5 g/mi and the ultimate statutory goal of a .41 g/mi standard.

2. *Objections to granting the waiver.* Witnesses at the hearing raised two arguments of a legal nature as to why the waiver should not be granted.

The Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association and others contended that since the California approach to measuring evaporative emissions was procedurally quite different from the Federal carbon trap test method, the "enforcement procedures" for the California standard failed to meet the statutory requirement that they be "con-

[1] "Diurnal" emissions are defined as those caused by the daily temperature variations to which the fuel system is exposed. "Hot soak" emissions are those which occur following hot vehicle operation, and are the result of the increase in carburetor and induction system temperatures, which causes fuel boiling and the expulsion of fuel vapors.

[1] For the 1971–74 Federal Vehicle certification, the evaporative emission test results always averaged less than 1.0 g/test, with 30% or more of the tests measuring less than 0.1 g/test. Of the values less than 0.1 g/test, roughly 60% were 0.0 g/test, a reading which almost invariably meant that the test netted a negative canister weight change.

[2] "Automotive Exhaust Emission Surveillance—A Summary," by Calspan Corporation, APTD 1544, May 1973.

[1] g/mi equivalent=[diurnal + 4.7 (hot soak)]/35 miles. The 4.7 hot soaks per day is based on the following study: D. H. Kearin and R. L. Lamoureaux, "A Survey of Average Driving Patterns in the Los Angeles Urban Area." TM-(L)-4119/000/01, System Development Corp., Santa Monica, California, February 28, 1969.

sistent with section 202(a)" of the Clean Air Act.

This argument misses an important distinction. No emission standard has meaning unless it is stated in terms of a test procedure by which the numbers in the standard itself is expressed) are peatable way. Yet, as I stated in my decision allowing California to establish its own 1977 exhaust emission standards, the basic purpose of section 209(b) is to allow California to have its own emission standards when it thinks it needs them.

The argument can be made, then, that since test procedures are necessarily part of the definition of any standard, California is free to state its standards in terms of any test procedure it wishes, as long as the various procedures for enforcing that standard and test procedure are consistent with those Federally adopted. On such a reading, California would clearly be entitled to the waiver, since the main enforcement mechanism it has chosen—certification—is identical in concept to a Federal enforcement mechanism, and the particular certification procedures to be used in 1977 (other than those in which the standard itself is expressed) are very close to and fully compatible with those EPA itself plans to use for future years. This would include, for example, vehicle selection, mileage accumulation, and maintenance procedures.

It might also be argued, however, that the Congressional concern for consistency extends to the test procedure in which the standard itself is expressed, and that this dictates a denial of California's application since the use of a SHED is concededly quite different from use of the carbon canister method.

Assuming the legal premise without conceding it, I do not believe the argument drawn from it is valid in this particular context. It would have force if the question concerned exhaust emission controls, where there has never been any reason why California could not express the more stringent standard it wanted in terms of the Federal test procedure. Here, by contrast, there is no way in which California can move to the more stringent evaporative controls which it has concluded are required except through a change in the test procedure by which the standard itself is established. Since the basic purpose of Section 209 is to allow California to have more stringent standards at its own option, to reject California's application for "inconsistency" in these circumstances would be to make "the tail wag the dog."

A separate kind of problem with "consistency" might develop if the test procedure by which the California emission standard was expressed was so different from the Federal procedure as to call for a technical effort of a different nature, along different lines. In those circumstances each vehicle would have to be tested by both procedures, since they would measure different things, and there would be at least a substantial probability that the two test results would have little or no correlation with one another. There would be no assurance that a vehicle which passes one of the tests would also pass the other, nor would there be any method of effiectively measuring the relative stringency of the two requirements. This is not the case here. Virtually all witnesses conceded that what the SHED test would require is a more intense effort to perfect the technology that is currently required. probability that the two test results The proof of that is in the technical judgment expressed by several witnesses, with which EPA concurs, that a car which passes the California SHED test will almost certainly pass the Federal canister test as well. In consequence, EPA will accept a vehicle's passing the California SHED test in certification as valid evidence that the Federal evaporative standard has been complied with for certification purposes. However, since the record reveals and it is reasonable to expect that exhaust emissions may be influenced by the evaporative emission control system (i.e., hydrocarbons introduced due to purging of the storage canister to the engine or exhaust system during the exhaust emission test), especially as exhaust emission levels are further reduced and evaporative emissions more effectively controlled, the present regulations will be amended to provide that in all cases the diurnal heat build portion of the evaporative test procedure will continue to be required as a portion of the preconditioning for the exhaust emission test.

The only situation, then, in which a manufacturer might be faced with the prospect of testing a given vehicle both by the SHED test and by the carbon canister method due solely to the lack of identity of test procedures is where that vehicle had failed the California evaporative test but would have passed the Federal test, and he wished to withdraw the vehicle from the California market and qualify it without modification for sale in the other 49 states. To state this sequence of events is enough to show that the likelihood of its occurring is low, and even in those rare instances where these events might come to pass, surely the impact on the manufacturer of running an additional test, after he has already expended an 18 month effort of technology application and production facility preparation (see 4. Lead Time, below), is comparatively a trivial matter. In light of these practical considerations, I believe this argument should be relegated to a *de minimis* status, and should not override the reasons which have been stated above for finding the "consistency" requirement satisfied.

The second argument was that the particular test procedure adopted by California was originally designed as a research tool and is both too cumbersome and too imprecise to be legally acceptable as a method of determining compliance. However, the J171(a) procedure is commonly conceded to be technically accurate, and many of the witnesses testified as to its superiority over the canister technique. Merely because it may be subject to improvement is no reason to reject it. Although my decision does not rest on this basis, we note that California is still refining the details of its approach and that it is likely many of the present objections of the auto companies can be resolved. Indeed, the ARB representatives testified that they plan to work closely with the manufacturers to refine the outstanding details of the procedure and they solicited the cooperation of the industry in this matter. I am confident that a satisfactory and mutually acceptable procedure can result from this process, particularly since under by decision no SHED test will be implemented until the 1978 model year.

3. *Technology.* Consistency with section 202(a) requires that there be technology available to meet the proposed standards. The manufacturers have maintained that that technology is still in the development stage and thus is not available. However, for the reasons stated below, I have concluded that such technology is available, within the meaning of section 202(a) of the Act.

Section 202(a)(2) requires that I must allow a sufficient period "* * * to permit the development and application of the requisite technology * * *" before a regulation prescribed under that subsection shall take effect. From all the information available to me, I have determined that the state of the art of the control of evaporative emissions is such that the additional engineering required to provide effective systems for a wide range of vehicle sizes and models must be characterized as the "application" of existing technology, rather than the "development" of new technology.

This conclusion is based upon two major factors. First, the test results presented at the hearing demonstrated that the systems needed for many vehicles are either presently available or nearly fully developed. As both the ARB and General Motors data indicated, the present production version of the GM Vega utilizes an evaporative system which effectively controls emissions to levels well below the 6 g/test standard (less than 2.0 g/test, according to the ARB). The Vega system consists primarily of a carbon canister to store the evaporative emissions from the fuel tank and the engine's fuel induction system, and includes the venting of the carburetor float bowl to the carbon canister. In addition, GM submitted data for two other production and nine experimental vehicles which passed a 6 gram SHED test. While it is understood that many of the experimental approaches involved were not intended to be representative of systems sufficiently refined at this point for application to production vehicles, nevertheless, the data do indicate that the basic design concept needed to achieve the required level of control is understood and that many of the design parameters which must be tailored to individual applications are at advanced stages of development. Like-

wise, the Volkswagen data indicated that many of their vehicles can either presently meet the 6 g/test standard, or will be able to meet it with the application of present knowledge associated with the control systems.

Second, based on tests conducted at the EPA laboratory facilities at Ann Arbor, Michigan, it appears that diurnal emissions can be limited to less than .5 g/test when a leak-tight control system vented through a carbon canister of sufficient capacity is utilized.

The major problem therefore seems to involve the control of hot soak emissions. In the opinion of my technical staff, control of those emissions depends primarily on (1) venting the carburetor bowl and air cleaner to the charcoal canister, (2) properly modifying the internal configuration of the carburetor to insure that the hot soak vapors are in fact routed into the storage canister, and (3) when the engine is in operation, properly routing the stored fuel vapors to the engine or exhaust system for subsequent oxidation.

Therefore, I believe it is proper to find that technology is available, in that a valid design concept is here now, and there is reason to conclude that it can readily be applied to a wide range of production vehicles. The engineering which may still be needed to adopt that concept, such as carburetor and "plumbing" changes or increased canister capacity, are sufficiently minor in nature that they should more properly be described as the "application," rather than the "development" of that concept.

4. *Lead Time.* Although I have determined that the technology does exist, the statute also requires a finding that there is sufficient lead time to apply it before a waiver may be granted. As is the case with all of the other findings required by section 209, the manufacturers have the burden of demonstrating that this condition is not met. As to this point, I conclude they have discharged that burden.

(i) The lead time involved must be spent in both translating the available technology into a form satisfactory for mass-production, and tooling and setting up the facilities to actually produce the vehicles. The record indicates that the two companies which have done the most SHED testing and appear to be furthest advanced—Ford and General Motors—could meet the proposed standard on about half their models by January 1, 1977, or in GM's case perhaps somewhat before. Both companies, however, argued that several more months of engineering work to apply the technology—perhaps as many as six—followed by a year or more of lead time for setting up production facilities would be needed to meet the standard on the rest of their vehicles. Although the possibility exists that these estimates may be unduly pessimistic, plausible reasons for them were given by the witnesses for these two companies and no concrete reasons for not accepting them were advanced by ARB or anyone else.

(ii) Almost all other manufacturers have done considerably less of the basic application testing than Ford or GM. Many foreign manufacturers do not yet have SHEDs. It is reasonable to conclude that the late start of these manufacturers relative to Ford and GM will result in a corresponding inability to produce vehicles meeting the standards as early as those two could.

(iii) Against this background, I conclude that the industry has met its burden of proof that the technology to meet the California standard, though available in one sense, simply cannot be applied to production vehicles in time for the 1977 model year.

IV. *Commitment to Federal effort.* Although, for the reasons given above, I believe the record reveals that the California standard cannot be met in 1977, the record is equally clear that that standard could be met not just in California, but nationwide, in 1978. Indeed, Ford took the initiative in suggesting that, in the interest of achieving uniform national standards the target date for a Federal standard be accelerated to 1978, and stated that "the probability is high" that such a target date could be met. Toyota, Subaru and Volkswagen each stated affirmatively that a 1978 target date for a national standard was reasonable. Although General Motors declined to make the same statement, a development flow chart included in their testimony which they said represented a "reasonable and economical" development schedule shows all necessary steps completed in time for a normal 1978 introduction date.

In these circumstances, considering the very significant hydrocarbon emission reductions which can be attained by adopting the SHED technique, and considering the desirability of a uniform national standard, I believe I would be remiss if I did not pledge EPA's best efforts to establish a Federal SHED standard for the 1978 model year.

The question may be raised as to why I am not today proposing specific Federal regulations to more effectively control evaporative emissions. Although in light of this decision such an action may appear appropriate, several practical concerns prevent me from taking it at this time. These concerns include the following: (1) There remain several important test procedure details which require resolution, (2) required Environmental and Inflationary Impact Statements have yet to be prepared, and (3) the review process for Federal regulations is more lengthy and comprehensive than the California process.

Several witnesses at the hearing expressed concern that the final California test procedure and any eventual Federal procedure be sufficiently alike so as not to hinder the progress of evaporative emission control by adopting a later procedure which requires major changes in the approach to the problem. I wholeheartedly agree with this position. It is the current judgment of my technical staff that any modifications or refinements which EPA may need to make with respect to SAE J171(a) will not require new design approaches or major test equipment changes on the part of the manufacturers.

V. *Decision.* A decision to take future steps toward establishing a Federal 1978 SHED standard, however, does not dispose of the California waiver application currently pending before me. For the reasons given above, I feel I must deny this application for the 1977 model year. However, California made clear to us that they are interested in obtaining a waiver for 1978 if they cannot have it for 1977. Therefore, I hereby waive the application of section 209(a) to the State of California with respect to section 1976, Title 13, California Administrative Code, as adopted on April 16, 1975, and amended on May 14, 1975, entitled "Standards and Test Procedures for Fuel Evaporative Emissions," insofar as it applies to the 1978 and subsequent model years. Upon the promulgation of the Federal standard and accompanying test procedure, the waiver will be reviewed with regard to the issues of the relative stringency and the consistency of the Federal and the California requirements, and any appropriate action will be taken at that time.

As noted earlier, inasmuch as the 6 g/test SHED standard is obviously more stringent than the 2 g/test Federal standard, in the event that no Federal SHED standard is established for 1978, EPA will accept the California SHED test results as valid evidence that the Federal evaporative emission standard has been met. However, the diurnal heat build portion of the SHED test procedure, since it may influence exhaust emission results, will be required as a portion of the preconditioning for the exhaust emission test.

Dated: July 11, 1975.

RUSSELL E. TRAIN,
Administrator.

[FR Doc.75-18613 Filed 7-17-75;8:45 am]

[FRL 402-2; PP 12]

PESTICIDE PETITIONS

Filing

Petitions proposing the establishment of pesticide tolerances in or on certain raw agricultural commodities have been filed with the Environmental Protection Agency. Notice is given pursuant to the provisions of section 408(d)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

The petitions and proposals are:

PP5F1637. Uniroyal Chemical, Bethany CT 06525, proposes to amend 40 CFR 180.301 to establish tolerances for the combined residues of the fungicide carboxin (5,6-dihydro-2-methyl-1,4-oxathiin-3-carboxanilide) and its metabolite 5,6-dihydro-3-carboxanilide-2-methyl-1,4-oxathiin-4-oxide (calculated as carboxin) in or on the raw agricultural commodity soybeans at 0.2 part per million (ppm). Proposed analytical method is a procedure in which caustic digestion cleaves aniline from the fungicide. The aniline is then removed by steam distillation and analyzed with a gas chromatograph using a microcoulometric nitrogen detector. PM21

PP5F1638. Uniroyal Chemical, Bethany CT 06525, proposes to amend 40 CFR 180.301 to establish a tolerance for combined residues of the fungicide carboxin (5,6-dihydro-2-methyl-1,4-oxathiin-3-carboxanilide) and its metabolite 5,6-dihydro-3-carboxanilide-2-methyl-1,4-oxathiin-4-oxide (calculated as carboxin) in or on the raw agricultural commodities sorghum grain, fodder and forage at 0.2 ppm. Proposed analytical method is same as above. PM21

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments on these petitions to the Federal Register Section, Technical Service Division (WH-569), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, Room 401, East Tower, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, D.C. 20460. Three copies of the comments should be submitted to facilitate the work of the Agency and others interested in inspecting them. The comments must be received on or before August 18, 1975, and should bear a notation indicating the subject and petition number. All written comments filed pursuant to this notice will be available for public inspection in the office of the Federal Register Section from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Dated: July 11, 1975.

JOHN B. RITCH, Jr.,
Director, Registration Division.

[FR Doc.75-18615 Filed 7-17-75;8:45 am]

[FRL 402-1; OPP-33000/286]

RECEIPT OF APPLICATIONS FOR PESTICIDE REGISTRATION

Data To Be Considered in Support of Applications

On November 19, 1973, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (38 FR 31862) its interim policy with respect to the administration of section 3(c)(1)(d) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), as amended. This policy provides that EPA will, upon receipt of every application for registration, publish in the FEDERAL REGISTER a notice containing the information shown below. The labeling furnished by each applicant will be available for examination at the Environmental Protection Agency, Room EB-31, East Tower, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460.

On or before September 16, 1975, any person who (a) is or has been an applicant, (b) believes that data he developed and submitted to EPA on or after October 21, 1972, is being used to support an application described in this notice, (c) desires to assert a claim for compensation under section 3(c)(1)(D) for such use of his data, and (d) wishes to preserve his right to have the Administrator determine the amount of reasonable compensation to which he is entitled for such use of the data, must notify the Administrator and the applicant named in the notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER of his claim by certified mail. Notification to the Administrator should be addressed to the Information Coordination Section, Technical Services Division (WH-569), Office of Pesticide Programs, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, D.C. 20460. Every such claimant must include, at a minimum, the information listed in the interim policy of November 19, 1973.

Applications submitted under 2(a) or 2(b) of the interim policy will be processed to completion in accordance with existing procedures. Applications submitted under 2(c) of the interim policy cannot be made final until the 60 day period has expired. If no claims are received within the 60 day period, the 2(c) application will be processed according to normal procedure. However, if claims are received within the 60 day period, the applicants against whom the claims are asserted will be advised of the alternatives available under the Act. No claims will be accepted for possible EPA adjudication which are received after September 16, 1975.

Dated: July 11, 1975.

JOHN B. RITCH, Jr.,
Director, Registration Division.

APPLICATIONS RECEIVED (OPP-33000/286)

EPA Reg. No. 264-2. Amchem Products, Inc., Brookside Ave., Ambler PA 19002. WEEDAR 64 BROAD LEAF HERBICIDE. Active Ingredients: Dimethylamine salt of 2,4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid 49.3%. Method of Support: Application proceeds under 2(b) of interim policy. Republished: Added use. PM23

EPA Reg. No. 264-20. Amchem Products, Inc. WEEDONE LV-4. Active Ingredients: 2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid, butoxyethanol ester 64.0%. Method of Support: Application proceeds under 2(b) of interim policy. Republished: Added use. PM23

EPA Reg. No. 264-109. Amchem Products, Inc. AQUA-KLEEN, THE GRANULAR 2,4-D WEED KILLER. Active Ingredients: 2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid, butoxyethanol ester 29.0%. Method of Support: Application proceeds under 2(b) of interim policy. PM23

EPA File Symbol 264-EAL. Amchem Products, Inc., AMCHEM WEED ONE-NO CRAB GRANULAR PREEMERGENCE CRABGRASS CONTROL HERBICIDE WITH AMEX 820. Active Ingredients: Butralin [4-(1,1-dimethylethyl)-N-(1-methylpropyl)-2,6-dinitrobenzenamine] 2.3%. Method of Support: Application proceeds under 2(b) of interim policy. PM23

EPA Reg. No. 264-284. Amchem Products, Inc. ANCHEM 2,4,5-T WOODY PLANT HERBICIDE. Active Ingredients: 2,4,5-Trichlorophenoxyacetic acid, butoxypropyl esters 66.5%. Method of Support: Application proceeds under 2(b) of interim policy. Republished: Added use. PM23

EPA Reg. No. 264-286. Amchem Products, Inc. AMCHEM 2,4,5-T WOODY PLANT HERBICIDE ODOR INHIBITED. Active Ingredients: 2,4,5-Trichlorophenoxyacetic acid, butoxypropyl esters 66.5%. Method of Support: Application proceeds under 2(c) of interim policy. Republished: Added use. PM23

EPA Reg. No. 264-289. Amchem Products, Inc. AMCHEM 2,4,5-TP WEED AND WOODY PLANT HERBICIDE. Active Ingredients: Butoxypropyl ester of silvex [2-(2,4,5-Trichlorophenoxy) propionic acid] 66.6%. Method of Support: Application proceeds under 2(c) of interim policy. Republished: Added use. PM23

EPA File Symbol 35909-I. Associated Water Conditioners, Inc., Route 202, Mt. Kemble Ave., Morristown NJ 07960. BIOCIDE 476. Active Ingredients: N-Alkyl Trimethylene Diamine 15%; Isopropyl Alcohol 15%. Method of Support: Application proceeds under 2(c) of interim policy. PM31

EPA File Symbol 8612-OR. B & G Co., PO Box 20372, Dallas TX 75220. BCG-4 EMULSIFIABLE CONCENTRATE. Active Ingredients: Technical Chlordane 45.3%; Petroleum Distillate 49.7%. Method of Support: Application proceeds under 2(c) of interim policy. PM15

EPA File Symbol 10595-L. Capital Chemical Co., 1607 High Point Ave., Richmond VA 23230. CAPCIDE-1. Active Ingredients: Poly [oxyethylene(dimethyliminio)ethylene(dimethyliminio)ethylene dichloride] 10.0%. Method of Support: Application proceeds under 2(b) of interim policy. PM34

EPA File Symbol 10595-A. Capital Chemical Co., 1607 High Point Ave., Richmond VA 23230. CAPCIDE-2. Active Ingredients: Poly [oxyethylene(dimethyliminio)ethylene(dimethyliminio)ethylene dichloride] 15.0%. Method of Support: Application proceeds under 2(b) of interim policy. PM34

EPA File Symbol 12610-G. Columbia Organic Chemicals Co., Inc., 912 Drake St., Cedar Terrace, Columbia SC 29290. SEIDEMAN'S SPECIAL ROACH KILLER. Active Ingredients: O,O-Diethyl O-(2-isopropyl-4-methyl-4-pyrimidinyl) phosphorothioate 0.5%; Pyrethrins 0.052%; Piperonyl Butoxide 0.260%; Petroleum Solvent 99.112%. Method of Support: Application proceeds under 2(c) of interim policy. PM15

EPA File Symbol 35968-R. Consumer Ecology Products, Inc., 101 SW 5th Ct., Pompano Beach FL 33060. WATER GUARD MODEL 333 VGC. Active Ingredients: Tank I Iodine 5%; Activated CArbon 95%; Tank II Oligodynamic silver (primarily silver oxide with trace amounts of Silver Chloride, Silver carbonate and metallic silver) 0.7%; Activated Carbon 99.3%; Tank III Activated Carbon 100%. Method of Support: Application proceeds under 2(c) of interim policy. PM34

EPA File Symbol 11524-I. Control Chemical Corp., 2090 Route 110, Farmingdale NY 11735. ROACH-GO II. Active Ingredients: Pyrethrins 0.052%; Piperonyl Butoxide, Technical 0.260%; Chlorpyrifos [O,O-diethyl O-(3, 5, 6-trichloro-2-pyridyl) phosphorothioate] 0.500%; Petroleum Distillate 98.736%. Method of Support: Application proceeds under 2(c) of interim policy. PM12

EPA Reg. No. 677-166. Diamond Shamrock Corp., Agricultural Chemicals Div., 1100 Superior Ave., Cleveland OH 44114. DACTHAL W-75 HERBICIDE. Active Ingredients: Dimethyl ester of tetrachloroterephthalic acid 75.0%. Method of Support: Application proceeds under 2(c) of interim policy. PM23

EPA Reg. No. 352-342. E. I. du Pont De Nemours & Co., Inc., Biochemicals Dept., 7056 Dupont Bldg., Wilmington DE 19898. LANNATE METHOMYL INSECTICIDE. Active Ingredients: S-methyl N-[(methyl carbamoyl)oxy] thioacetimidate 90%. Method of Support: Application proceeds under 2(b) of interim policy. Republished: Added use. PM12

EPA Reg. No. 352-372. E. I. du Pont De Nemours & Co., Inc., Biochemical Dept., 7056 Dupont Bldg., Wilmington DE 19898. DUPONT VYDATE L OXAMY' INSECTICIDE/NEMATICIDE. Active Ingredients: Methyl *N'N'* - dimethyl - *N* - [(methylcarbamoyl) oxy]-1-thiooxamimidate 24%. Method of Support: Application proceeds under 2(b) of interim policy. Republished: Added use. PM12